

CASE NO.: 50P4257.04
Serial No.: 09/974,724
October 14, 2004
Page 8

PATENT
Filed: October 9, 2001

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. All previously pending claims have been rejected based on substantive grounds.

The claim objections and indefiniteness rejections have been corrected. Of relevance to the amended claims are the previous rejection of Claim 4 (the limitations of which now appear in independent Claims 1 and 11) under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Zegelin et al. (USPN 6,694,430) combined with Lee et al. (USPN 6,728,531) and Camhi (USPN 5,825,283), and of Claim 20 as being obvious over Zegelin et al. and Lee et al. Independent Claim 31 has been canceled, and independent Claim 30 has been amended to recite a camera system that is not taught or suggested in any other applied references. Support for amended Claim 30 can be found at page 7, third full paragraph.

Accordingly, with respect to Claims 1 and 11, the examiner has alleged that Camhi, "column 16, lines 32" (it is believed that the examiner is referring to col. 16, lines 16-32) teaches automatically sending received data "at a predetermined point". What Camhi actually teaches is uploading vehicle information when a collision is sensed, independently of remaining memory capacity, which indeed Camhi does not appear to contemplate. In contrast, Claims 1 and 11 now require automatic data transmission if the first memory means exceeds a predetermined threshold (Claim 1) or if a data amount in the memory module violates a threshold (Claim 11). Accordingly, the proposed combination of references would not arrive at Claims 1 and 11.

Consider next Claim 20, which requires, in a wireless device, instructing an operational file to select a destination and then sending received data using the wireless module to the selected destination. The Office Action alleges that Lee et al., col. 11, lines 48-53 and col. 12, lines 39-49 teaches this aspect. Applicant

1168-105.AMD

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CASE NO.: 50P4257.04
Serial No.: 09/974,724
October 14, 2004
Page 9

PATENT
Filed: October 9, 2001

respectfully does not believe this to be the case. It appears that Lee et al. is directed to allowing a user of a wireless device to select *sources* of data to be downloaded, not *destinations* to which data may be uploaded.

The fact that Applicant has focussed its comments distinguishing the present claims from the applied references and countering certain rejections must not be construed as acquiescence in other portions of rejections not specifically addressed.

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-106.AM12

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:



BLACK BORDERS

☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**

☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**

☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**

☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**

☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**

☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.